UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,383	10/17/2003	Ie-Hong Lin	020292	2247

23696 7590 10/29/2007

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED
5775 MOREHOUSE DR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

EXAMINER	
MILLER, BRANDON J	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2617	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/29/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com
kascanla@qualcomm.com
nanm@qualcomm.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/688,383	LIN, IE-HONG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brandon J. Miller	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 July 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *17 October 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Request to Withdraw Finality

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 5, 9, 13-16, 19-20, 24, 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bourgoin et al. (US 6,643,521 B1) in view of Dunn et al. (5,873,040).

Regarding claim 1 Bourgoin teaches obtaining a plurality of received signals for a plurality of transmitters (see col. 4, lines 51-52 and FIG. 1). Bourgoin teaches receiving a signal from each transmitter (see col. 3, lines 12-15). Bourgoin teaches determining candidate transmitter for the received signal (see col. 3, lines 30-31 & 35-38). Bourgoin teaches obtaining predicted power for each candidate transmitter in the list (see col. 3, lines 31-35). Bourgoin teaches accepting the transmitter for the received signal based on predicted powers for the candidate transmitters and measured power for the received signal (see col. 4, lines 55-65). Bourgoin does not specifically teach determining a list of candidate transmitters and determining and/or identifying transmitters in a wireless communication system. Bourgoin does teach

determining a candidate transmitter for the received signal (see col. 3, lines 30-31 & 35-38). Dunn teaches identifying transmitters in a wireless communication system (see col. 2, lines 42-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device in Bourgoin adapt to include determining a list of candidate transmitters and determining and/or identifying transmitters in a wireless communication system because Bourgoin teaches determining candidate transmitters and the signals received from transmitters in Bourgoin inherently include identification information.

Regarding claim 2 Bourgoin and Dunn teach a device as recited in claim 1 except for comparing the predicted power for each candidate transmitter against the measured power for the received signal, and wherein the identified transmitter for the received signal is the candidate transmitter with predicted power closest to the measured power. Bourgoin does teach supplying the measured power for the received signal to prediction means which predict power for the candidate transmitter. Dunn does teach identifying transmitters in a wireless communication system (see col. 2, lines 42-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include comparing the predicted power for each candidate transmitter against the measured power for the received signal, and wherein the identified transmitter for the received signal is the candidate transmitter with predicted power closest to the measured power Bourgoin teaches determining candidate transmitters and the signals received from transmitters in Bourgoin inherently include identification information.

Regarding claim 3 Bourgoin teaches coverage zones to use for the received signal, and wherein the predicted power for each candidate transmitter is obtained based on the coverage zone (see col. 3, lines 18-23).

Regarding claim 5 Bourgoin teaches wherein the coverage zone is derived based on one or more coverage areas of one or more transmitters (see col. 3, lines 10-23 and Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 9 Bourgoin teaches wherein the wireless communication system is a CDMA system (see col. 1, lines 20-23).

Regarding claim 13 Bourgoin teaches receiving a signal from transmitters in a wireless communication system (see col. 3, lines 12-15). Bourgoin teaches obtaining a plurality of received signals for a plurality of transmitters (see col. 4, lines 51-52 and FIG. 1). Bourgoin teaches determining a transmitter for each received signal (see col. 3, lines 12-15). Bourgoin teaches determining a candidate transmitter for the received signal (see col. 3, lines 30-31 & 35-38). Bourgoin teaches obtaining predicted power for each candidate transmitter in the list (see col. 3, lines 31-35). Bourgoin teaches obtaining predicted power for an identified transmitter (see col. 3, lines 31-35). Bourgoin teaches accepting the transmitter for the received signal based on predicted powers for the candidate transmitters and measured power for the received signal (see col. 4, lines 55-65). Bourgoin does not specifically teach determining a list of candidate transmitters; determining the transmitter for the received signal based on predicted powers for the candidate transmitters, the predicted power for the identified transmitter, measured power of the received signal, and measured power for the identified transmitter. Bourgoin does teach determining a candidate transmitter for the received signal (see col. 3, lines 30-31 & 35-38). Bourgoin does teach predicting powers for candidate transmitters (see col. 3, lines 31-34) and

measured power for received signals (see col. 4, lines 55-59). Dunn teaches determining transmitters in a wireless communication system (see col. 2, lines 42-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device in Bourgoin adapt to include determining a list of candidate transmitters; determining the transmitter for the received signal based on predicted powers for the candidate transmitters, the predicted power for the identified transmitter, measured power of the received signal, and measured power for the identified transmitter because Bourgoin teaches determining candidate transmitters and the signals received from transmitters in Bourgoin inherently include identification information.

Regarding claim 14 Bourgoin and Dunn teach a device as recited in claim 13 except for comparing a relative predicted power for each candidate transmitter against a relative measured power for the received signal, the relative predicted power being a difference between the predicted power for the candidate transmitter and the predicted power for the identified transmitter, the relative measured power being a difference between the measured power of the received signal and the measured power for the identified transmitter, and wherein the identified transmitter for the received signal is the candidate transmitter with predicted power closest to the measured power. Bourgoin does teach determining a predicted power for each transmitter and determining a measured power for each transmitter (see col. 4, lines 55-65 and claim 1). Dunn teaches identifying transmitters in a wireless communication system (see col. 2, lines 42-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device in Bourgoin adapt to include comparing a relative predicted power for each candidate transmitter against a relative measured power for the received signal, the relative

predicted power being a difference between the predicted power for the candidate transmitter and the predicted power for the identified transmitter, the relative measured power being a difference between the measured power of the received signal and the measured power for the identified transmitter, and wherein the identified transmitter for the received signal is the candidate transmitter with predicted power closest to the measured power because Bourgoin teaches determining candidate transmitters and the signals received from transmitters in Bourgoin inherently include identification information.

Regarding claim 15 Bourgoin and Dunn teach a device as recited in claim 3 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 16 Bourgoin and Dunn teach a device as recited in claim 9 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 19 Bourgoin teaches obtaining a plurality of received signals for a plurality of transmitters (see col. 4, lines 51-52 and FIG. 1). Bourgoin teaches determining a candidate transmitter for the received signal (see col. 3, lines 30-31 & 35-38). Bourgoin teaches obtaining predicted power for each candidate transmitter in the list (see col. 3, lines 31-35). Bourgoin teaches accepting the transmitter for the received signal based on predicted powers for the candidate transmitters and measured power for the received signal (see col. 4, lines 55-65). Bourgoin does not specifically teach determining a candidate list for the received signal and determining and/or identifying transmitters in a wireless communication system. Bourgoin does teach determining a candidate transmitter for the received signal (see col. 3, lines 30-31 & 35-38). Dunn teaches identifying transmitters in a wireless communication system (see col. 2, lines 42-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to make the device in Bourgoin adapt to include determining a candidate list for the received signal and determining and/or identifying transmitters in a wireless communication system because Bourgoin teaches determining candidate transmitters and the signals received from transmitters in Bourgoin inherently include identification information.

Regarding claim 20 Bourgoin and Dunn teach a device as recited in claim 3 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 24 Bourgoin and Dunn teach a device as recited in claim 19 except for wherein the transmitter for each received signal is further identified based on predicted power for the identified transmitter for the received signal. Bourgoin does teach accepting the transmitter for the received signal based on predicted powers for the candidate transmitters and measured power for the received signal (see col. 4, lines 55-65). Dunn does teach identifying transmitters in a wireless communication system (see col. 2, lines 42-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device in Bourgoin adapt to include wherein the transmitter for each received signal is further identified based on predicted power for the identified transmitter for the received signal because Bourgoin teaches determining candidate transmitters and the signals received from transmitters in Bourgoin inherently include identification information.

Regarding claim 26 Bourgoin and Dunn teach a device as recited in claim 9 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 27 Bourgoin teaches obtaining a plurality of received signals for a plurality of transmitters (see col. 4, lines 51-52 and FIG. 1). Bourgoin teaches determining a candidate transmitter for the received signal (see col. 3, lines 30-31 & 35-38). Bourgoin teaches

obtaining predicted power for each candidate transmitter in the list (see col. 3, lines 31-35). Bourgoin teaches accepting the transmitter for the received signal based on predicted powers for the candidate transmitters and measured power for the received signal (see col. 4, lines 55-65). Bourgoin does not specifically teach determining and/or identifying transmitters in a wireless communication system and determining a plurality of lists of candidate transmitters, one candidate list for each received signal. Bourgoin does teach determining a candidate transmitter for the received signal (see col. 3, lines 30-31 & 35-38). Dunn teaches identifying transmitters in a wireless communication system (see col. 2, lines 42-51). Dunn teaches a computer program product and a computer-usable medium for storing codes (see abstract and col. 4, lines 62-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device in Bourgoin adapt to include determining and/or identifying transmitters in a wireless communication system and determining a plurality of lists of candidate transmitters, one candidate list for each received signal because Bourgoin teaches determining candidate transmitters and the signals received from transmitters in Bourgoin inherently include identification information.

3. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bourgoin et al. (US 6,643,521 B1) in view of Dunn et al. (5,873,040) and Remy (US 2002/0039905 A1).

Regarding claim 4 Bourgoin and Dunn teach a device as recited in claim 3 except for predicted power for each transmitter that is obtained for a centroid of the coverage zone. Kennedy, Jr. does teach predicted power for transmitters that is obtained for a coverage zone (see col. 4, lines 32-42). Remy teaches a centroid of the coverage zone (see paragraph [0022]). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include predicted power for each transmitter that is obtained for a centroid of the coverage zone because this would allow for improved accuracy in location determining systems.

4. Claims 6-8, 10-12, 17-18, 21-23, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bourgoin et al. (US 6,643,521 B1) in view of Dunn et al. (5,873,040) and Kennedy, Jr. et al. (US 6,920,329 B2).

Regarding claim 6 Bourgoin and Dunn teach a device as recited in claim 1 except for wherein the predicted power for each candidate transmitter is determined based on a path loss prediction model. Kennedy, Jr. teaches wherein the predicted power for candidate transmitters is determined based on a path loss prediction model (see col. 4, lines 24-31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include wherein the predicted power for each candidate transmitter is determined based on a path loss prediction model because this would allow for an efficient method for Bourgoin to predict transmitter power.

Regarding claim 7 Kennedy, Jr. teaches wherein the path loss prediction model is based on Okumura-Hata model (see col. 4, lines 3-8).

Regarding claim 8 Kennedy, Jr. teaches wherein the predicted power for each transmitter is determined based on field data (see col. 4, lines 32-38).

Regarding claim 10 Bourgoin and Dunn teach a device as recited in claim 9 except for wherein the list of candidate transmitters for each received signal comprises a list of base station transceivers (BTSs) with same PN offset. Kennedy, Jr. teaches a list of candidate transmitters that comprise base stations (see col. 4, lines 54-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include a list of base station transceivers (BTSs) with same PN offset because this would allow for the transmitters in Bourgoin to have improved communication with neighboring cells.

Regarding claim 11 Bourgoin and Dunn teach a device as recited in claim 1 except for obtaining predicted propagation delay for each candidate transmitter in the list, and wherein the transmitter for the received signal is further identified based on predicted propagation delays for the candidate transmitter and measured propagation delay for the received signal. Kennedy, Jr. teaches obtaining predicted propagation delay for candidate transmitters, wherein the transmitter is further identified based on predicted propagation delays for the candidate transmitter (see col. 4, lines 27-31 & 54-61). Dunn teaches identifying transmitters in a wireless communication system based on measured conditions (see col. 2, lines 42-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include obtaining predicted propagation delay for each candidate transmitter in the list, and wherein the transmitter for the received signal is further identified based on predicted propagation delays for the candidate transmitter and measured propagation delay for the received signal because this would allow for the transmitters in Bourgoin to have improved communication with neighboring cells.

Regarding claim 12 Bourgoin and Dunn teach a device as recited in claim 11 except for determining a power delta for each candidate transmitter as a difference between the predicted power for the candidate transmitter and the measured power of the received signal, determining a propagation delay delta for each candidate transmitter as a difference between the predicted propagation delay for the candidate transmitter and the measured propagation delay for the received signal, and obtaining a weighted sum of the power delta and the propagation delay delta for each candidate transmitter, and wherein the identified transmitter for the received signal is the candidate transmitter with a smallest weighted sum. Bourgoin does teach supplying the measured power for the received signal to prediction means, which predict power for the candidate transmitter. Dunn does teach identifying a transmitter by evaluating a measured parameter with a predetermined event or condition (see col. 2, lines 42-51). Kennedy, Jr. does teach determining a propagation delay for each candidate transmitter (see col. 4, lines 27-31 & 54-61). Kennedy, Jr. does teach obtaining a weighted sum of the propagation delay for each candidate transmitter, and identifying a candidate transmitter for a received signal (see col. 4, lines 55-61 and col. 6, lines 13-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include determining a power delta for each candidate transmitter as a difference between the predicted power for the candidate transmitter and the measured power of the received signal, determining a propagation delay delta for each candidate transmitter as a difference between the predicted propagation delay for the candidate transmitter and the measured propagation delay for the received signal, and obtaining a weighted sum of the power delta and the propagation delay delta for each candidate transmitter, and wherein the identified transmitter for the received signal is the candidate transmitter with a

smallest weighted sum because this would allow for the transmitters in Bourgoin to have improved communication with neighboring cells.

Regarding claim 17 Bourgoin and Dunn teach a device as recited in claim 13 except for obtaining predicted propagation delay for each candidate transmitter in the list, obtaining predicted propagation delay for the identified transmitter, and wherein the transmitter for the received signal is further identified based on predicted propagation delays for the candidate transmitter, predicated propagation delays for the identified transmitter, measured propagation delay for the received signal, and measured propagation delays for the identified transmitter. Kennedy, Jr. does teach obtaining predicted propagation delay for transmitters, wherein the transmitter is further identified based on predicted propagation delays for the candidate transmitter (see col. 4, lines 27-31 & 54-61). Dunn teaches identifying transmitters in a wireless communication system based on measured conditions (see col. 2, lines 42-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include obtaining predicted propagation delay for each candidate transmitter in the list, obtaining predicted propagation delay for the identified transmitter, and wherein the transmitter for the received signal is further identified based on predicted propagation delays for the candidate transmitter, predicated propagation delays for the identified transmitter, measured propagation delay for the received signal, and measured propagation delays for the identified transmitter because this would allow for the transmitters in Bourgoin to have improved communication with neighboring cells.

Regarding claim 18 Bourgoin and Dunn teach a device as recited in claim 17 except for determining a relative power delta for each candidate transmitter, determining a relative

propagation delay delta for each candidate transmitter, and obtaining a weighted sum of the relative power delta and the relative propagation delay delta for each candidate transmitter, and wherein the identified transmitter for the received signal is the candidate transmitter with a smallest weighted sum. Kennedy, Jr. does teach determining a propagation delay for each candidate transmitter (see col. 4, lines 27-31 & 54-61). Kennedy, Jr. does teach obtaining a weighted sum of the propagation delay for each candidate transmitter, and identifying a candidate transmitter for a received signal (see col. 4, lines 55-61 and col. 6, lines 13-20). Dunn teaches identifying transmitters in a wireless communication system based on measured conditions (see col. 2, lines 42-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include determining a relative power delta for each candidate transmitter, determining a relative propagation delay delta for each candidate transmitter, and obtaining a weighted sum of the relative power delta and the relative propagation delay delta for each candidate transmitter, and wherein the identified transmitter for the received signal is the candidate transmitter with a smallest weighted sum because this would allow for the transmitters in Bourgoin to have improved communication with neighboring cells.

Regarding claim 21 Bourgoin, Dunn, and Kennedy, Jr. teach a device as recited in claim 6 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 22 Bourgoin, Dunn, and Kennedy, Jr. teach a device as recited in claim 7 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 23 Kennedy, Jr. teaches means for storing information used for the path loss prediction model (see col. 4, lines 24-32).

Regarding claim 25 Bourgoin, Dunn, and Kennedy, Jr. teach a device as recited in claim 11 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Claim Rejections - 3$ USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. A computer program product is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. See, e.g., Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory.

Similarly, computer programs claimed as computer listings per se, i.e., the descriptions or expressions of the programs, are not physical "things." They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer

programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. See Lowry, 32 F.3d at 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d at 1035. Accordingly, it is important to distinguish claims that define descriptive material per se from claims that define statutory inventions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 13, in line 7 recites "obtaining predicated power for an identified transmitter". This limitation renders the claim indefinite because it is does not adequately distinguish this transmitter from the other transmitters in the claim and it does not adequately describe how the transmitter is identified.

The above art rejection is based upon the best possible interpretation of the claims in light of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claim Objections

7. Claims 1, 13, 19, and 27 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Independent claims 1, 13, 19, and 27 uses identifying transmitters and determining transmitters inconsistently throughout the claims. For example claim 13, which recites "determining a transmitter for each received signal by...determining the transmitter for the received signal based on...predicted power for the identified transmitter". Such inconsistent usage renders the claims unclear and makes it difficult to ascertain the exact boundaries of each claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Smolik Patent Number 6,119,005 discloses a system for automated determination of handoff neighbor list for cellular communication systems.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon J. Miller whose telephone number is 571-272-7869. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

October 23, 2007

GEORGE ENG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER